



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/553,967	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-48700	6558
7590	08/09/2004			EXAMINER
Robert C Kowert Conley Rose & Tayon PC P O Box 398 Austin, TX 78767			TRAN, TONGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004				

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/553,967	ALLAVARPU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tongoc Tran	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 5/3/2004.

Claims 1-52 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/3/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument in respect to independent claims that Hu fails to teach "wherein the client-side library is implemented in accordance with a platform-independent interface specification and implemented for one or more client platforms respectively corresponding to each of the one or more client computer systems" which Examiner has asserted that the teaching is old and well known. Applicant further contends that there is no suggestion to combine Hu's patent with the old and well known teaching because Hu teaches away from Applicant's claim 1 by using an authentication gateway to bridge the gap between incompatible client/server security protocols. Examiner agrees with Applicant that Hu's authentication gateway is to bridge the incompatible systems of the client and server by acting as a server proxy for authenticating a client for a server when the client and server have different security mechanisms. However, the authentication gateway taught by Hu addresses the security mechanism in the lower layer of the network while the platform independent interface feature serves the purpose at the upper layer of the network. The implement of well known authentication system with platform independent interface (e.g. using JAVA) on Hu would be an improvement to enable different systems to communicate across the network but it would not teach away the claimed invention because both are implemented

in the different levels in the network. In response to Applicant's remark, Examiner is providing a prior art as an example of the old and well known teaching.

Applicant further argues that Hu fails to teach one or more pluggable authentication modules and does not couple to one or more managers (claims 10, 27 and 44). The claims recite "one or more pluggable authentication modules which are operable to provide authentication of a manager based upon a user profile...", it can be broadly interpreted that a pluggable authentication module (an authentication library) is connected to one or more of the client computers (Hu, col. 5, lines 5-20).

In response to applicant's remark that the rejection of the secondary prior art, Thompson patent, is relied upon the filing date of the provisional application. Therefore, Examiner is providing a copy of the provisional application to show that the cited limitation is taught both in Thompson patent and the provisional application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-24, 26-31, 33-41, 43-49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,260) in view of Shambroom (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,661).

In respect to claim 1, Hu discloses a network management system comprising:
a client-side authentication library deployed on one or more client computer

systems, wherein the client-side authentication library comprises a client side interface which is operable to retrieve and encrypt a user profile associated with a user, and wherein the client-side library is implemented for one or more client platforms respectively corresponding to each of the one or more client computer systems (see col. 2, lines 1-19 and col. 5, lines 4-19); and

a server-side authentication library deployed on a server computer system coupled to the client computer system, wherein the server-side authentication library comprises a server-side interface which is operable to receive the encrypted user profile from the client-side authentication library and decrypt the user profile to authenticate the user for one or more network services, and wherein the server-side library is implemented for a server platform corresponding to the server computer system (see 4, line 59-col. 5, line 19).

Hu does not explicitly disclose but Shambroom discloses the authentication modules are implemented in accordance with a platform-independent interface specification (see Shambroom, Abstract, col. 2, lines 26-65). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shambroom's platform independent authentication module with Hu's authentication system in a distributed network where different objects (users or resources) across the network with different platforms can interact with each other.

In respect to claim 2, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 1, wherein the client-side authentication library is shared by a plurality of management applications (see Hu, col. 5, lines 4-19).

In respect to claim 3, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 1, wherein the server-side authentication library is shared by a plurality of gateway components (see Hu, col. 5, lines 4-19).

In respect to claim 4, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not explicitly disclose wherein the server-side authentication library is implemented in C++. However, implementing C++ programming language in server-side is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize C++ for the server because of the language's object-oriented features and its stability.

In respect to claim 5, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 1, wherein the user profile comprises a user name and a password (see Hu, col. 4, lines 28-32).

In respect to claim 6, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 5, wherein the user profile further comprises a designation of a management information server (MIS) to which the user wishes to connect (see Hu, col. 1, lines 16-19).

In respect to claims 7 and 9, Hu and Shambroom disclose the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not disclose wherein the platform-independent interface specification comprises a specification expressed in an interface definition language (IDL), wherein the interface definition language is operable to define object interfaces across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages; wherein the client-side authentication library and the server-side authentication library are operable to authenticate requests received by a CORBA

gateway, wherein the requests comprise management requests to one or more managed objects, and wherein the management requests are sent by one or more manager applications. However, Implementing CORBA and IDL in a distributed network environment are old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shambroom's platform independent authentication module and Hu's authentication system between a client and a server in a distributed networking environment with CORBA and IDL for its supports for interacting with distributed objects across the network regardless of where or what platform the objects are located.

In respect to claims 10 and 11, Hu discloses a network management system comprising:

a gateway which is coupled to one or more managers, wherein the gateway is configured to provide network management services to the one or more managers; and one or more pluggable authentication modules which are operable to provide authentication of a manager based upon a user profile, wherein the user profile corresponds to a user of one of the managers, and wherein the one or more pluggable authentication modules are accessible by the gateway and the one or more managers; and wherein the gateway is configurable to authenticate the user to receive the network management services using the pluggable authentication modules (see Hu, col. 2, lines 1-19 and col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 19).

Hu does not explicitly disclose but Shambroom discloses the authentication modules are implemented in accordance with a platform-independent interface specification (see Shambroom, Abstract, col. 2, lines 26-65). Therefore, It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shambroom's platform independent authentication module with Hu's authentication system in a distributed network where different objects (users or resources) across the network with different platforms can interact with each other.

In respect to claims 12-13 and 15-17, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 1, 5-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 12-3, and 15-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 18-24 and 26, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar to system claims 1-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 18-26 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 27-31 and 33-34, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar to system claims 10-13, 15-17. Therefore, claims 27-31 and 33-34 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 35-41 and 43, the claim limitations are computer programmable medium claims that are substantially similar to system claims 1-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 35-41 and 43 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 44-49 and 51-52, the claim limitations are computer programmable medium claims that are substantially similar to system claims 10-13 and 15-17. Therefore, claims 44-49 and 51-52 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

4. Claims 8, 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,260) in view of Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,050).

In respect to claim 8, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not explicitly disclose wherein the user profile is encrypted and decrypted according to a user-selected encryption scheme. However, Thompson discloses encryption scheme is selected according to user's preference (see col. 4, lines 4-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hu's encrypting user profile with Thompson's user-selected encryption scheme according to the different types of data or user's preference (Thompson, col. 4, lines 4-12, provisional application, pages 4-5, Summary of Invention).

In respect to claims 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claim 8. Therefore claims 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT



July 26, 2004


